What is National Socialism?

by Dale Peterson

Introduction

This essay will attempt to give a broad understanding of what National Socialism is. It is written for the uninformed but curious average citizen, but I suspect it will be of interest as well to many who already find themselves with racist/racialist beliefs. National Socialism is more than just racism. National Socialism is biology put into practice on a National societal level, whereas racism is simply the common-sense application of evolutionary inequality to humans. Rather than a FAQ on National Socialism, this will hopefully answer in reasonable depth what National Socialism is, for I am asked "what is National Socialism" far more than I am questioned on the principles of National Socialism.

To allow one to reconcile the differences between National Socialism and the other political systems out there, one fact must be established beforehand, and that is that National Socialism is not simply a political system or a form of government, but a general philosophy, a Weltanschauung (German word of which the best translation probably is "world-view" or "world-philosophy"). It offers an insight into many spheres; political, philosophical, biological, and economic being the four major ones, and therefore those I will explain here. But one must remember that National Socialism is a Weltanschauung at heart, whereas Democracy is simply a governmental system.

One must also realize that man is neither hermit nor herd animal, but a little of both, because these traits are not mutually exclusive. He has individualistic traits, but he also has socialistic traits. He is both himself and part of a group. Only National Socialism recognizes this fact, whereas the capitalists would like us to believe that we are only individuals, and the communists are telling us we are only part of a greater collective. We must recognize that individuality must be limited at the point where it is a detriment to the social good, and that collectivism must be limited where it begins to destroy the soul of the individual.

POLITICAL NATIONAL SOCIALISM

National Socialism is best viewed as the family structure applied to government. The family is connected by blood, by soil, and by love. Similarly, a National Socialist state is connected by blood (race), by soil (territory), and by love (comradeship, patriotism). Comparing the National Socialist folkish state with a family is a very basic way of looking at the way National Socialism is run politically. Like a family, the National Socialist state is only the vessel and the race is what it contains. The vessel can have a value only if it preserves and safeguards the contents. The

value of one is inferior to the value of the whole, and, if need be, the lesser must be sacrificed to protect the greater. In a National Socialist state, one has rights and a proportionate amount of responsibilities. He has freedom and liberty to do what he will, as long as it is not at the detriment of anyone else or the racial nation itself.

Elections

There are no popular elections in a National Socialist state, just as there are none in a family. Elections rarely produce a strong leader, rather, they produce politicians, and the very politicians who are most adept at lying and decieving the populace are the ones who usually win. In a democratic system, the votes of two idiots count for more than that of one well-informed man. In a National Socialist system will, character, and ability are the three main tenets of leadership, and leaders are appointed to office by their superiors rather than elected.

By way of this appointment, the leaders of a National Socialist state have absolute power to make decisions over their particular field. Some say that absolute power corrupts absolutely, but society must front up to three facts before being so hasty to throw this type of catch phrase around.

First - Power must be given to somebody, else there is no more than anarchy.

Second - It is essential to have responsibility for power, lest it be misused. Where one man is making the decisions, he alone is responsible for the outcome of those decisions. Where votes are taken in a parliament or senate, responsibility is so divided that effectively no one is held accountable.

Third - Given power's tendency to corrupt, it makes more sense to entrust it to him who shows the best character, and is consequently more able to resist its corrupting influence.

If two men stand together, and one is to have power over the other, it is natural that it should be the better man, the man with the stronger will, the better character, and the superior ability, that rules over his companion. This is the formula that has always stood throughout Man's history, and is in fact the very basis of any structured and hierarchal society outside of human society. It is the strongest and most dominant lion who leads the pride -- he is the one who is the most likely to make the best decisions most of the time. If he becomes unsuitable for his position at the top, whether it be because he becomes too foolish or too old, there is always a younger and smarter lion waiting in the wings to take his place. The same is true in the National Socialist folkish state.

Responsibilities

Under the democratic systems, responsibility is split up among numerous individuals, and ultimately lies with the general public that elects the electors. This leads to the undesirable situation of the electors or representatives having little to no responsibility for the way in which

they use (or misuse) their power. The very worst that could happen is that they manage to fall out of favor with their electorate come the next elections, and lose their seat in office. We can see, through the various hucksters and showboat politicians we have had leading our nations, that this is little deterrant to wildly abusing political power.

In the National Socialist system however, ultimate responsibility lies in one man, the leader (Führer), to make ultimate decisions. Should those decisions turn out to be made in error, then he must accept responsiblity for those errors and hand over his power to a more capable person.

Other leaders, subordinate to the Führer, have dual responsibilities, not only to their decisions, but to carrying out the decisions of their superiors. Should these duties be carried out to the satisfaction of their superiors, they are rewarded with more power; should they not, then their power is reduced or they are deposed.

Rights

Rights are not given to the individual by some spook in the sky. For one to give rights he must have a way of enforcing them, and an imaginary spirit in the sky can not and does not. Rights are granted by the more powerful to the less poweful, and they come with responsibilities. If the rights-granters and enforcers are corrupt or tyrranical, then the inferior must earn the right to become granters and enforcers themselves by demonstrating their superior character through revolution.

Under National Socialism rights are directly proportionate to one's responsibility to the folkish state. There are people (subjects) who have very little responsibility, and consequently have very few rights. There are others (citizens) who have a normal responsiblity and enjoy the same rights as most everyone else. And there are those (leaders) who bear the burden of tremendous responsibility and have not only personal rights, but guarantee the rights of others (in other words, they hold political power).

Structure

The structure of a National Socialist government is, as I said, like that of a family. It is ruled from the top down, in a pyramid fashion, rather than the other way around, as the democracies. Every leader has council and advisors, but that council is there to advise that particular leader on a certain things, not to make decisions. The advice travels upward, the decisions travel downward. Committees may be held, but again, the purpose of these bodies is to advise those making the decisions, rather than to make the decisions themselves.

Democracy, at its heart, is mob rule. Whoever is in favor with the mob is "right," and whoever is not is "wrong." A small minority may actually be right about something yet drowned out by the large majority and the many voices of their misinformed argument. With the advent of mass media this tendency is strengthened, as the folks behind the amplifiers can more or less create

"public opinion." Indeed, so strong are the mass media that public opinion can be shaped and manipulated in such a way that the majority of people, never well informed ever, are firmly convinced they're in the driver's seat by the media-masters who really do exert the control. At the end of the day you have a society governed by the will of the masses, yes, but a will manipulated-created by the media moguls (who tend to be Jewish). Under this democratic mob rule, with it's glorification of the dunce's opinion, a mob mentality quickly predominates, and its effects are vastly compounded by the media. The mob mentality by its very nature is an attempt to bring everyone into one line of thinking, with people trying to approximate the mean, and therefore become part of the majority. True aristocrats learn to dress, behave -- live -- down in an attempt to be men of the people. In a society where the majority is always right, who wants to be in the minority, which is by definition wrong? The standard that determines elections comes to determine quality -- and everything else. Racial and social destruction ensue, benefiting only the Jews of the mass media, operating behind the scenes like the man behind the screen in "Wizard of Oz."

National Socialism, by contrast, offers open Aryan control in place of hidden Jewish manipulation. There is virtually no way a foreign interest (such as the Jews are, and always have been, to Aryans) can secure public opinion via the mass media, primarily because the media is strictly regulated by the government, and secondly because the opinions of the majority public matter little in a National Socialist state. This makes National Socialism a comparitavely stable political system, and one relatively unaffected by foreign subversion. National Socialism is governed from the top down, whereas Democracy (mob rule) rules -- pretends to rule -- from the bottom up. Humans are always and everywhere ruled by a minority elite; the real question is in whose actual interests that elite operates, not whose name.

ECONOMIC NATIONAL SOCIALISM

Many Reactionaries make the error of closely comparing National Socialism to Communism in terms of economical policy, when in fact the two stand wide apart from each other. It is also interesting to note that the Communists claim National Socialism is not socialism at all, and is in fact the purest form of Capitalism. In reality, however, National Socialism is neither Capitalism nor Communism, but takes natural and healthy elements from each one to form a more "centrist" style of government. Neither laissez-faire Capitalism nor bolshevik Communism have ever worked in practise, and neither of them will work because they are both two sides of the same coin. What we need, rather than one unhealthy extreme or the other, is a healthy median, a balance, between the two. The National Socialist state allows capitalistic principles, but not at the expense of the collective folk.

Economic individualism

In a National Socialist society, unlike Communism, there is certainly private ownership of property and land, and there is private ownership of possessions and capital. But unlike

Capitalism, though, financial interests are curtailed and restricted at the point where they begin to have a negative effect on the folkish state. One example of this might be the charging of usurious interest rates on loans, which binds the working class into the slavery of an endless debt/interest cycle. Interest rates for the public should never be raised past a fraction of a percent, and this should be set in place by the central nationalized bank (Reichsbank) and this rate controlled by the Minister of Finance through the President of the Reichsbank. The charging of interest on loans by any other organization or business or individual is strictly forbidden, for that is the acquisition of income for those not employed or making no effort which is also forbidden.

Usury forbidden

That last statement might come as a shock to some of you, namely; that the gaining of income without work should be forbidden. Allow me to explain.

When an individual is gaining wealth through means whereby he is not contributing an equal amount of effort in exchange, it means that somewhere along the way someone is making more effort than he should in order to feed and clothe and house this individual who is contributing nothing himself. That should be considered nothing short of slavery by any civilized society, and that's exactly what usury is. Money or wealth by its very nature does not replicate itself.

If Paul keeps a dollar bill for a hundred years, at the end of that time he still has a dollar bill, it is worth no more than it was a century earlier. If he lends that dollar bill to Josef and Josef agrees to pay Paul a dollar-fifty at the end of that hundred years, then effectively, all Paul's done is manage to exploit Josef at a time of need, for his own profit.

Say that your brother was starving, would you force him to work like a slave for you before you gave him a meal? Certainly no civilized man would do such a thing to his own brother. One must certainly wonder why the so-called civilized men of the world today would think nothing of doing the same to his fellow racial countryman in the form of usury. This is not an Aryan trait, rather a Jewish one. Jews are predominantly behind the usurious practices in our society with absolutely criminal 25% interest rates and the like. Slavery and exploitation are not what racial comrades do to one another, and that is why in the folkish state this usurious slavery is forbidden.

Labor unions nationalized

To promote better understanding between workers and employers, all labor unions are nationalized into one monolithic body, which in Germany was known as the Deutsche Arbeitsfront (DAF). This organization is headed by one individual known as the Arbeitsführer (Work Leader) who is, in turn, responsible to the Führer. Any conflicts or disputes that do arise between employers and workers are resolved through mediation between representatives of the DAF and the employer, by an organization set up for that purpose.

This organization shall take the form of a commission consisting in an equal proportion of representatives of various industries and representatives from the "DAF" who are representative of the workers of various said industries, and chaired by a representative of the Economics Ministry. This organization shall have power to appoint a mediator or make recommendations and suggestions to the representative of the Economics Ministry who alone has the power to force a solution.

It is worthy of note that there was not one strike in any of the twelve years this system was active under Adolf Hitler.

Value of currency

The value of currency in a National Socialist state shall be directly tied to the productive capacity of the racial folkish state. It shall not be backed with the capital of the people (as the American Dollar is), nor of the capital of the state (i.e. gold standard, silver standard) but rather be guaranteed by the productivity of the folkish state.

Fractional reserve banking is a fraud perpetrated on the nations of this world by the Jew. The system a National Socialist state takes for its currency is that every unit of money is worth a specific amount of WORK rather than gold, silver, land, or property. Therefore it is the duty of the Economics Minister to recognize the total value of the productivity of the National Socialist state and the duty of the President of the "Reichsbank" to set the value of currency at an appropriate level to match this value.

PHILOSOPHICAL NATIONAL SOCIALISM

Most every other philosophy, political notion, or religious belief stems from the absurd notion that human beings are somehow above Nature, that for some strange reason, biological laws just don't apply to humans. National Socialism is the only one that accepts the concrete fact that humans are indeed part of Nature also.

It is National Socialism that is the ideology of Nature -- the living of one's life based on Natural principles.

One can choose to live in a material fashion, pursuing wealth, short-term gratification, fornication, or other "feel good" goals. Or one can choose to live in a way that reflects accordance with Nature, in pursuit of an idealistic goal which may not be achieved for centuries, patiently waiting for love over simple fornication, and replacing the Jewish notion that money is king with the Aryan one that excellence is king.

There is more to life than material wealth.

National Socialists hold the premise that it is better for a society to be motivated toward a higher goal than simply "feeling good" in the present, and that in fact pursuing this short-term goal

society is left worse off, just as the individual ends up feeling sorry for himself in the long term.

The basis for this "feel good" mentality is rather childish. A child does not plan for the future, he wants his gratification NOW, and that is all that matters to him. The Negro's general mentality runs along the same lines. We have had our mature, logical tendency toward forethought and preparedness Niggerized by the Jew into this infantile "me want feel good now" line of thinking.

Quality and quantity

National Socialism is an ideology of quality over quantity. National Socialists would rather have a better society than a large one; we would rather have fewer, better people than a great number of mediocre people. We want a society that encourages White families, not black. Whites invest great amounts of energy and time in the development of their children, whereas the blacks they are forced by the Jewish system to subsidize invest little beyond the reproductive gametes. This will be covered in more detail later on, when I write of the biological principles underlying National Socialism.

The individual and the collective

National Socialism recognizes the fact that men are born neither isolated individuals nor members of an ant colony.

We are born into the world as both an individual will and spirit and part of a family, the basic unity of society. We are also born into a race, which is merely an extension of the family -- a larger family of distant relatives with whom we share a common genetic bond. It is only sensible to recognize both of these realms rather than ignore one (as collectivist communism does) or the other (as individualist capitalism does).

Equality and inequality

I cover biological differences later on, but I am more concerned with the philosophical argument here.

One recurring argument of the egalitarians is that "we are all human," "we are all self-conscious," "we all bleed," and therefore we are all the same. The same might be said of numerous animals, though. Degrees of difference are all-important, and we see the fact reflected around us everywhere.

Morals

Morals are nothing but opinion, usually mass opinion, codified into a set of doctrines that are at their root, completely arbitrary. There is no universal morality. Opinions are neither right nor wrong, just facts, because only facts can be demonstrated so.

One man's morality might be different from mine, and both may differ from Bob's next door. A

hundred years ago homosexuality was immoral, but today the majority of the populace believes it's perfectly moral (this however, does not mean it's not unnatural and unhealthy). General morals can change over time, they are very fluid and plastic and can be influenced by factors.

This is why I laugh when people tell me that the wholesale extermination of the Jews known as the 'Holocaust' is "wrong" because it's "immoral." Since morals are opinions, what they are in fact saying is "its wrong because I think it's wrong," which is ridiculous. In all honesty I think the Jews got exactly what they deserved in the 'Holocaust.' My view on this might be considered immoral to some, but to me it's perfectly moral. That is the ultimate justification of the argument that morals are opinions and nothing else. If they were absolutes, how could one have a contrary set of morals to another?

Whose superiority?

In the natural world, the strong dominate the weak. The higher evolved forms dominate and subjugate the lower evolved forms. In nature, might is the only right and extinction is the punishment for weakness.

This is true for humans when one looks at the way the higher races have dominated the lower for the last few millennia. There is nothing "wrong" with dominating those of an inferior kind; those who are not strong enough to preserve their independence are either absorbed or crushed.

What one will usually hear in response to this argument is that since the Aryan race is in such a docile state at the moment, and since the majority of our kind are at the beck and call of the Jew, there is also nothing "wrong" with this, as we couldn't have been subjugated if we were the superior breed.

This is ABSOLUTELY TRUE. If the Aryan dies out it will be because he is NOT STRONG ENOUGH to dominate the Jewish parasite that caused his death. Ergo, the wheels of nature complete one more cycle, and the White man falls from the top of the tree as an extinct species.

But things at the moment all rely on that "if." I do not believe that we will be rendered extinct and I do not believe that the Jew is the superior breed to effect this biological revolution. I (along with the rest of the White Nationalist community) believe that we are the superior kind, and that we can overcome the Jewish grip on our society. If we do, then we prove our superiority, if we do not, then we are a race whose fate is already a foregone conclusion.

That is why it is up to us to fight, and fight hard, and resist the Jewish scuttling of our Aryan boat, because only through the success or failure of this resistance do we prove our superiority. If our biological boat sinks, it will be because we failed to kill the parasite that was eating away at our hull. And the punishment for that failure will be in accordance with natural law - extinction.

BIOLOGICAL NATIONAL SOCIALISM

National Socialism has its roots in nature; it is merely natural priciples (rule of one, natural selection, race as family, etc.) applied to the political and the general philosophical realms. In that sense it is Natural Socialism, it is neither extreme individualism nor extreme collectivism, for neither of these are natural and both of them assume men to be above nature. It is biology taken to its logical political and social conclusions.

Simple biological principles

Why is it that with the evidence in front of the eyes of every biologist in the world, only a minute percentage has the sense to advocate putting these solid evolutionary biological principles into social application? That they have not done so shows me that their cowardice overrides their intelligence.

The races are not equal. They did not evolve equally because the environments in which they evolved were different. It should be common sense, therefore, to conclude that the races cannot be considered equal in any way, shape, or form. They are distinct biological branches of the human species.

The White man in the harsh climate of Alpine Europe needed a larger brain to survive there than did the lowly Negro roaming the African continent with a spear in his hand and a bone through his nose, and a large plate in his lip. The African climate is temperate, and game abounds. For those who can master simple hunter/gatherer skills, survival there is a breeze. Not so in Alpine Europe, where the harshness of the climate demands a different type of survival. It demands shelter from the cold. It demands ingenuity in hunting or trapping the comparatively little game. It demands foresight in saving food for the winter. It demands warm clothes. Altogether, it demands a degree of inventiveness other locales do not. Should it not be therefore obvious that the White Aryan man would evolve in a way that suits this type of thinking-on-one's-feet lifestyle, while the Negro should evolve in a way that best allowed him to survive in the African heat?

Socio-reproductive trends

Certainly they should evolve differently. In fact, if we are to accept evolution and modern biology at all they MUST evolve differently. One of the ways in which this difference is quite striking is in the socio-reproductive strategies of the races, and how they differ.

The lower races, typified by the Negro, have a socio-reproductive strategy that tends toward producing as many offspring as possible, paying little or no regard to the way in which said offspring are raised, or their intellectual aspects cultured. The Aryan by contrast focuses on raising and developing fewer but higher quality offspring: quality over quantity.

It is undoubtable that these trends played a role in forming the biological traits of the current races as we know them. Focusing more on breeding caused that aspect to be more pronounced in

the Negro, whose children are born on average a week earlier than those of the Aryan and mature faster. Whereas focusing more on development caused the intellectual and creative traits to be enhanced in the Aryan. These traits were enhanced by their respective breeding strategies.

Of course, we cannot attibute all the racial differences to socio-reproductive behavior alone, as that itself is a racial trait, and the root of these always has and always will be Natural Selection. But we can observe that these same socio-reproductive trends that are an evolved behavior can themselves influence the evolutionary development of a race, magnifying the effects of Natural Selection and increasing the difference between races.

Branching of species

In all areas of Nature does one see the branching of species; first into different breeds, then sub-species, then wholly independent species. This is how species come into being, how they evolve, and how they adapt to different environments.

This branching is necessary both for the advancement of the species into a higher form, and for the protection of the species through biological diversity and resistance to threat.

Branching of the species occurs where a mutation causes a biological separation of one group from the greater species. This mutation and others like it eventually adapt a particular sub-species to a particular environment to which the greater species would not be otherwise suited, or at least not as suited as the new sub-species.

This is also how the differences between the races came about. White people evolved for the European environment, which forced them to become more intellectual and creative; the Oriental evolved for the Eastern environment in which he stayed at fairly the same level; and the Negro on the dark continent did virtually nothing but eat and breed, and consequently became rather adept at both these tasks.

Separation of the races

What we must remember is that a mixing of the Negro, or of any other race with our Aryan kind is UNNATURAL. It is unnatural because it runs contrary to the basic evolutionary principle of branching the species. In nature the White man and the Negro would be separated by vast amounts of land, far too much land for any serious mongrelization of either race to occur. But by modern transportation technology these distances are crossed daily without second thought, and the races meet and fraternize with one another. It is the geographical mixing of races that leads to a biological mixing of races which again, would otherwise not have occurred.

And it is this mixing of races that runs contrary to the development and branching of species into races and into sub-species and at last into independent species themselves. Should the Aryan and the Negro, or any other race for that matter, stay apart and evolve independently long enough, there will come a stage where interbreeding is no longer possible. But should we all mix into one

planet of coffee-colored brillo-haired Mulattos, Sambos and Mestizos there will be no biological diversity, no branching of the species, and evolution will be set back some 200,000 years to a point where races again begin to form and the branching starts over again. Would it not be therefore more progressive to preserve this biological independence and continue evolution as it is, rather setting it back and retarding its eventual continuation?

CONCLUSION

As we can see, the National Socialist Weltanschauung is considerably more than a political system like Republicanism or Democracy, or even an ideological economic system like Communism or Capitalism. It is something more, something else.

It is not a religion or something that is expected to be taken on grounds of faith; the principles I have outlined here are solidly rooted in fact and logic. There are no spooks in the sky here, or utopian promises of universal equality. The very concept of National Socialism means simply a racial state -- an extension of the family, the folk, the people.

National Socialism is at its root, NATURAL socialism. It is the foundation for natural society, and it is nothing more than these natural -- biological -- premises put together into a cohesive and structured way of looking at the world. There are no references here, there are no abstracts one must rely on or comprehend before he can understand the principles of National Socialism. One need only rely on logic and reason and biology to fully understand National Socialism and every justification of the principles that at its heart. National Socialism is nothing more than applied biology. Mother Nature is a NAZI.

DALE PETERSON